

Step fluctuations and random walks

M. Bisani and W. Selke

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Hochschule, D-52056 Aachen, Germany

Abstract

The probability distribution $p(l)$ of an atom to return to a step at distance l from the detachment site, with a random walk in between, is exactly enumerated. In particular, we study the dependence of $p(l)$ on step roughness, presence of other reflecting or adsorbing steps, interaction between steps and the diffusing atom, as well as concentration of defects on the terrace neighbouring the step. Applying Monte Carlo techniques, the time evolution of equilibrium step fluctuations is computed for specific forms of return probabilities. Results are compared to previous theoretical and experimental findings.

Keywords: Stepped single crystal surfaces; Atomistic dynamics; Monte Carlo simulations

Corresponding author:

Prof. Walter Selke

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Hochschule, D-52056 Aachen, Germany

Tel: 0049-241-80-7029; Fax: 0049-241-8888-188

e-mail: selke@physik.rwth-aachen.de

1. Introduction

In recent years, the dynamics of steps on crystal surfaces has attracted much interest, both experimentally [1-6] and theoretically [7-11]. Experimentally, equilibrium step fluctuations of isolated steps as well as steps on vicinal surfaces have been studied extensively, following pioneering STM measurements of Au(110) [1] and Cu(11n) [2] surfaces. The step fluctuations are quantified by the correlation function $G(t) = \langle (h(i, t) - h(i, 0))^2 \rangle$, where $h(i, t)$ denotes the position (or displacement) h of the step at site i and time t . Typically, the experimental data are described by a power law, $G(t) \propto t^\gamma$, with the dynamic exponent γ being in between about 1/4 and about 1/2. Theoretically, distinct atomic mechanisms driving the step dynamics have been identified, leading, indeed, at long times, to power laws, with γ being 1/4, 1/3, and 1/2 in the limiting cases of step diffusion, terrace diffusion, and evaporation–condensation kinetics, respectively. These scenarios have been found in Langevin descriptions [7,9,10] and confirmed, partly, in simulations on SOS models [7,11].

In this article, step fluctuations will be analysed in the framework of random walks of atoms detaching from the (reference) step, diffusing on the neighbouring terrace, and attaching again at the step at distance l (in units of the lattice spacing on the surface) from the detachment site. The corresponding return probability distribution $p(l)$ is determined for various situations, to analyse the influence of the step roughness, of the presence of another reflecting or adsorbing step separated by d lattice spacings from the reference step, of the interaction of the diffusing atom with the steps due to, e.g., elastic forces, as well as of the concentration of reflecting or adsorbing defects on the terrace. The case of a straight step with no obstacles on the terrace and without interactions between the atom and the step has been considered before, solving the related continuum diffusion equation, in the context of a Langevin theory, where $p(l)$ is called diffusion kernel [9]. Here, results on $p(l)$ will be then incorporated in Monte Carlo simulations of the step fluctuations. We shall present

simulational results for special choices of return probabilities connecting detachment and attachment step sites, including the three limiting cases mentioned above. One of the main points will be to elucidate the relation between those probability distributions and the step fluctuations characterised by $G(t)$. Indeed, deviations from the simple power law for $G(t)$ are found, which may play a relevant role in interpreting experimental observations.

The article is organized as follows. In the next section, the model used to describe step fluctuations is introduced, and the methods applied in the analysis, exact enumeration of random walks and Monte Carlo simulations, are introduced and outlined. Results on the return probability distribution $p(l)$ are given in section 3, followed by a discussion of simulational findings on $G(t)$. A brief summary will conclude the paper.

2. Model and methods

Let us consider a (reference) surface step of monoatomic height with $2L + 1$ sites, $i = -L, -L + 1, \dots, 0, \dots, L - 1, L$. The positions of the step atoms, at time t , are denoted by $h(i, t)$. Setting the lattice spacing equal to one, h is an integer. The step is perfectly straight, if h is constant. The neighbouring terrace, consisting of sites (i, j) on a square lattice, may be bordered by a straight step opposite to the reference step, separated by d lattice spacings, see Fig. 1. The opposite step, with $2L + 1$ sites, is supposed to either reflect (variant s_r) or absorb (s_a) an adatom diffusing on the terrace, mimicing either a descending step with a high Schwoebel–Ehrlich barrier or a rising step with a large sticking coefficient.

Specific boundary conditions may be used at the ends of the reference step, $i = -L$ and $i = L$. For instance, the ends may be pinned or subject to periodic boundary conditions. Alternatively, the boundaries of the terrace perpendicular to the reference and opposite steps may be, e.g., chosen as straight reflecting (variant t_r) or absorbing (t_a) straight steps with d sites.

Step fluctuations result from the detachment of an atom from the reference step at site i , $h \rightarrow h - 1$, and attachment at step site $i + l$, $h \rightarrow h + 1$. The rate of this process depends on the energies involved and temperature. One may distinguish three limiting cases, (a) $l = \pm 1$, corresponding to step diffusion; (b) uncorrelated detachment and attachment sites, corresponding to evaporation–condensation kinetics; and (c) initial and final sites being connected by a random walk of the diffusing atom on the terrace neighbouring the step, corresponding to terrace diffusion. Several types of terrace diffusion are possible, reflecting various constraints on the random walk, see below. The time dependence of the step fluctuations may be quantified by the correlation function

$$G(t) = \langle (h(i, t) - h(i, 0))^2 \rangle \quad (1)$$

The brackets denote a thermal average.

We applied two methods in our study: (i) exact enumeration of random walks [12], to investigate different kinds of terrace diffusion, and (ii) Monte Carlo simulations [13], to compute $G(t)$.

(i) In enumerating random walks, we calculate the return probability distribution $p(l)$ of an atom detaching from site i_0 of the reference step onto the terrace (the step positions being then fixed once and for all, $h_0(i) = h(i, t)$) and attaching at step site $i_0 + l$. In other words, the atom starts its random walk at terrace site $(i_0, h_0(i_0) + 2)$, and one determines the probability that it reaches the site $(i_0 + l, h_0(i_0 + l) + 1)$ first among all possible absorption sites at the reference step. The terrace is supposed to be bordered by either reflecting or absorbing steps perpendicular and opposite to the reference step. Obviously, one has

$$\sum_l p(l) \leq 1 \quad (2)$$

where the sum runs over all step sites. The identity holds when the boundary steps are reflecting. Usually, the starting point of the random walk is chosen at the center of the step,

$$i_0 = 0.$$

The exact enumeration of $p(l)$ is based on calculating the probability $p_{\text{rw}}(i, j, n)$ of the diffusing atom to be at terrace site (i, j) in the n -th move of the random walk [12,14]. The total probability, summing $p_{\text{rw}}(i, j, n)$ over all sites, is conserved and equal to one. p_{rw} is related to the probability to jump from the neighbouring site (i', j') to site (i, j) , $w(i', j', i, j)$, by

$$p_{\text{rw}}(i, j, n) = \sum_{i'j'} w(i', j', i, j) p_{\text{rw}}(i', j', n-1) + w_s(i, j) p_{\text{rw}}(i, j, n-1) \quad (3)$$

where $w_s(i, j)$ is the probability to stay at terrace site (i, j) . For an absorption site, at the reference or a boundary step, one has $w_s(ij) = 1$ and $w(i, j, i', j')=0$, while for the other terrace sites $w_s(i, j) = 0$.

On finite terraces, $p_{\text{rw}}(i, j, n)$ can be calculated in a straightforward fashion for a variety of jump probabilities and boundary conditions, with the bookkeeping done by a computer programme (exact analytic results are known only for rather few special cases [15]). The return probability distribution $p(l)$ is given by

$$p(l) = p_{\text{rw}}(i_0 + l, h_0(i_0 + l) + 1, n) \quad (4)$$

considering indefinitely long random walks, $n \rightarrow \infty$. In practice, the length of the walk, n , depends on the convergence rate of p_{rw} . We studied steps of length $L \leq 600$, with the width of the terrace $d \leq 600$. Typically, the random walks ended when the total probability of finding the atom on any non-absorption terrace site was smaller than 10^{-8} .

(ii) In our Monte Carlo simulations an atom at step site i is moved to site $i+l$ with a (return) probability $p_{\text{da}}(l)$. The form of $p_{\text{da}}(l)$ is motivated by the findings on the random walks, $p(l)$. The move is then accepted, as usual, with a rate determined by the Boltzmann factor of the associated energy change δE , $\exp(-\delta E/k_B T)$, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T

the temperature [13]. The energies at the step are assumed to be given by the number and depth of the kinks [16], as it is the case in the standard SOS model [17] with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \epsilon \sum_{[i,j]} |h(i, t) - h(j, t)| \quad (5)$$

where the sum runs over neighbouring step sites $[i, j]$, $j = i \pm 1$. To speed up the simulations, we used an algorithm with a dynamic time assignment [13,18].

The time t , elapsed during the simulation, is measured in terms of Monte Carlo attempts per step site pair (MCA), i.e. in one time unit one has tried to interchange, on average, one atom between each two step sites (the Monte Carlo time scale is linearly related to the real time). This interpretation corresponds to the situation where the time spent by the diffusing atom on the terrace is negligibly small compared to the mean time spent at the step. More realistic approaches using, e.g., kinetic Monte Carlo simulations for the surface dynamics, may suffer from other shortcomings, such as an ambiguity in the step position. Note that the average position of the entire step, $\sum_i h(i, t)/(2L + 1)$, does obviously not depend on time.

To compute the step fluctuations $G(t)$, see eq. (1), one has to define a starting time, $t = 0$. Various choices are possible, corresponding to various initial step configurations, including straight and equilibrated steps. Perhaps closest to experiments, one may average over an ensemble of thermalized step configurations, possibly during a single Monte Carlo run (which will be called, in the following, dynamic averaging). In addition, one may impose different boundary conditions, for instance, by pinning the end positions of the step, at $i = 1$ and $2L + 1$, or applying periodic boundary conditions. In the later case, boundary effects are less severe.

Typically, we studied steps of length $2L + 1 \leq 256$, with periodic boundary conditions.

3. Random walks

Using the exact enumeration approach, the return probability distribution $p(l)$ has been calculated for four distinct cases, mimicing possible constraints on the terrace diffusion: (a) non-perturbed random walk, $w(i', j', i, j) = 1/4$, with a straight reference step, see Fig. 2; (b) diffusing atom in an external potential, $V = A/y^2$, y being the distance between the (straight) steps and the atom, due to, e.g., elastic interactions [19], see Fig.3. Note that due to the potential V the jump probability $w \propto \exp(-\delta V/k_B T)$, with $\delta V = V(i', j') - V(i, j)$, becomes anisotropic, favouring hops away from the step; (c) unbiased diffusion, $w = 1/4$, on a terrace with quenched absorbing single-site defects of concentration c , with a straight reference step, see Fig.4; and (d) non-perturbed random walk with a rough reference step (the roughness mimics a thermalized reference step).

In each case, the wandering atom started at the center of the reference step, at terrace site $(0, h_0(0) + 2)$. The three boundary steps were assumed to be straight and either reflecting or absorbing. For instance, ' $s_r : t_a$ ' refers to a situation with a reflecting opposite step and absorbing terrace boundary steps perpendicular to it.

In general, one may distinguish four regimes, in which $p(l)$ exhibits different characteristic properties, depending on the return distance l . At very short distances of a few lattice spacings, $l < l_0$, $p(l)$ falls off rapidly, the concrete form being determined by details of the perturbations (step roughness, concentration of defects and strength A of the elastic interaction).

At $l_0 \ll l \ll d$, $p(l)$ acquires typically a power-law behaviour, $p(l) \propto l^\alpha$. To analyse that regime, one may calculate the effective exponent

$$\alpha_{\text{eff}}(l) = d \ln p(l) / d \ln l \quad (6)$$

being constant, $\alpha_{\text{eff}} = \alpha$, if, indeed, the decay of $p(l)$ follows a simple power-law. Increasing the return distance l furthermore, the effect of the boundaries on the random walk shows up. Assuming $L \gg d$, first the presence of the opposite (vicinal) step affects the return probability, leading to a characteristic exponential decay of $p(l)$, $p \propto \exp(-al)$, both for reflecting, s_r , and absorbing, s_a , steps. Finally, the distribution $p(l)$ will be modified due to the perpendicular terrace boundaries, t_r or t_a .

As illustrated in Fig. 2 for the non-perturbed case, α_{eff} tends to approach $\alpha = -2$, in agreement with the solution of the corresponding continuum diffusion equation [9]. Consequently, one expects $p(l) = p_0 l^{-2}$ at sufficiently large return distances l for indefinitely long isolated straight steps (note that α is expected to determine the value of the dynamic exponent γ describing the time dependence of the step fluctuations $G(t)$ [9], see below). Actually, neither the interaction of the diffusing atom with the steps nor the step roughness seem to affect that value of α . In fact, for a rough reference step, $\alpha_{\text{eff}}(l)$ follows closely the form for a straight step, $l > l_0$ [14]. Applying the potential $V = A/y^2$, we observe a systematic dependence of the proportionality factor p_0 on A , as shown in Fig. 3. p_0 is found to increase exponentially with the interaction strength A , $p_0 \propto \exp(\eta A)$, with $\eta \approx 1.23$, at least for the strengths we considered, $0 \leq A \leq 1$. As depicted in Fig. 4, our findings do not rule out that the value of α may, however, depend on the concentration c of defects on the terrace. Over an appreciable range of return distances l one may notice a plateau-like behaviour in α_{eff} at a value slightly, but definitely smaller than -2 . E.g., at $c = 0.2$, the plateau-like behaviour occurs at about -2.2 ; at $c = 0.1$, the effective exponent α_{eff} seems to settle for some distances l at a value below, but closer to -2 . However, the data do not allow to rule out the possibility that $\alpha = -2$ may be approached, now from below, at larger return distances l . Of course, it would be desirable to consider longer steps and larger terraces to study further this aspect. Such computations would be extremely computer time consuming, because one has to average over a large number of defect concentrations to get meaningful data (typically, we averaged over about 10 000 realizations).

With increasing l , the return probability distribution $p(l)$ of the diffusing atom approaches an exponential decay, $p(l) \propto \exp(-gl)$ in all four cases, (a)–(d). Accordingly, the exponential form describes $p(l)$ for large return distances l in the presence of a neighbouring, descending or rising, step, separated by d lattice spacings. For the unbiased random walk with straight steps the coefficient g , as follows from exact enumeration, agrees, to a high degree of accuracy, with the one obtained from the continuum diffusion equation [9], namely $g = \pi/d$ for an absorbing opposite step, and $g = \pi/2d$ for a reflecting, vicinal step. The various perturbations seem to have little effect: The decay form of $p(l)$ remains exponential, and even the coefficient g seems to be rather robust.— In the unbiased case, (a), we found that $p(l, d)$ seems to scale, at $d \gg 1$, as $p(l, d) = p_s(l/d)/d^2$, both in the power-law and the exponential regime [14].

Finally, with l getting closer to L , the perpendicular terrace boundaries become relevant. As expected, $p(l)$ is lower when the boundaries are absorbing than in the reflecting situation. However, we did not explore this region in much detail, because those boundary conditions are somewhat artificial and extremely long random walks, see eq. (4), would be needed for quantitatively correct results.

4. Monte Carlo simulations

We simulated the fluctuations $G(t)$ of steps of length $M = 2L + 1$, with their ends being connected by periodic boundary conditions. An atom is detached at the randomly chosen site i and attached at site $i + l$, see Fig. 1. The (return) probability of selecting site $i + l$ is denoted by $p_{\text{da}}(l)$. The probability of accepting such an elementary move is given by the Boltzmann factor of the energy change, see eq. (5), associated with this process.

We studied mainly five distinct cases, with the choice of $p_{\text{da}}(l)$ being motivated by results on

the return probability distribution $p(l)$ of a random walk and by general physical considerations. In particular, we considered $p_{\text{da}}(l)$ being (i) constant, corresponding to evaporation–condensation kinetics. Obviously, the mean step position is conserved in each move. We also simulated evaporation–condensation dynamics by choosing between detachment and attachment completely randomly, thus conserving the mean step position only in the time average; (ii) $1/2$ for $l = \pm 1$ and 0 elsewhere, describing step diffusion; (iii) proportional to $1/l^2$ (the prefactor is determined by requiring that $p_{\text{da}}(l)$ is normalized: $\sum p_{\text{da}}(l) = 1$), as one may expect for fluctuations of an isolated step due to terrace diffusion, neglecting deviations from that form at short distances l between attachment and detachment sites; (iv) proportional to $\exp(-l)$, monitoring the possible effect of a neighbouring step on $G(t)$; and (v) proportional to $1/l^3$, to study the sensitivity of $G(t)$ on the value of α in $p_{\text{da}}(l) \propto l^\alpha$.

For indefinitely long steps, one may argue that $G(t)$ increases with time in the form of a power-law $G(t) \propto t^\gamma$ [7-10], with the dynamic exponent γ depending on the atomistic mechanism governing the fluctuations. To determine γ in the various cases we simulated, one may calculate the effective dynamic exponent

$$\gamma_{\text{eff}}(t) = d \ln G(t) / d \ln t \quad (7)$$

with $\gamma_{\text{eff}}(t)$ approaching γ at large times and long steps.

Results on $\gamma_{\text{eff}}(t)$ for each of the five situations are depicted in Fig. 5, at fixed step length, $M = 256$, and fixed temperature $k_B T / \epsilon = 1$. We used dynamic averaging over an ensemble of successive, equilibrated initial configurations. Evaporation–condensation kinetics was simulated by random attachment and detachment processes, i.e. without conserving the average step position in each Monte Carlo move.

At very early times, the step fluctuations are always diffusive, with $G(t) = c_d t$, corresponding to $\gamma_{\text{eff}} = 1$. The diffusion coefficient c_d depends rather weakly on the transport mechanism,

with the exception of the evaporation–condensation dynamics having a significantly larger diffusion coefficient.

Due to the rigidity of the step, the step meandering then slows down, with γ_{eff} approaching a plateau located at about $1/2$, $1/3$, or $1/4$, depending on the form of the return probability, p_{da} , see Fig. 5. Actually, the plateau at $\gamma_{\text{eff}} \approx 1/2$, characterising evaporation–condensation, is reached most quickly. The plateau at $1/3$ is realised for terrace diffusion with an isolated step, $p_{\text{da}}(l) \propto 1/l^2$. The largest time is needed to approach the plateau at $1/4$, characterising step diffusion as well as terrace diffusion with rapidly decaying return probabilities, $p_{\text{da}}(l) \propto 1/l^3$ and $\propto \exp(-l)$. The last situation corresponds to terrace diffusion with pairs of steps. One may argue that the plateau signals the asymptotic power law increase of $G(t) \propto t^\gamma$ for large times and indefinitely long steps. Indeed, the plateau values have been obtained before in Langevin descriptions [7-9] for infinitely extended steps (for $-3 < \alpha < -2$, one may expect a continuously varying value, $\gamma = 1/(-\alpha + 1)$ [9]).

Combining our results on the random walks and simulations, we conclude that the exponent $\gamma = 1/3$ for an isolated step is robust against various perturbations of terrace diffusion, with the possible exception of defects on the terrace.

The estimates of the plateau values of γ_{eff} are confirmed by a Fourier analysis of the step fluctuations $h(i, t)$. They can be written in the form

$$h(i, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{M/2} (a_k(t) \sin(2\pi ki/M) + b_k \cos(2\pi ki/M)) \quad (8)$$

The fluctuation modes may be described by

$$G_k(t) = \langle (a_k(t) - a_k(0))^2 + (b_k(t) - b_k(0))^2 \rangle \quad (9)$$

taking into account phase shifts. Based on Langevin descriptions, $G_k(t)$ is expected to converge rapidly towards equilibrium $G_k(\infty)$ [7-9],

$$G_k(t) = G_k(\infty)(1 - \exp(-I_k t)) \quad (10)$$

in agreement with the simulational data. More specifically, for small wavenumbers, I_k follows closely the form $I_k \propto k^x$, with $x = 1/\gamma$, in accordance with the Langevin theory. However, I_k shows pronounced deviations from the power-law behaviour at larger values of k , as shown in Fig. 6. This feature is not described by the Langevin theory [7].

At later times, after having passed the plateau, the effective dynamic exponent, γ_{eff} , will eventually go to zero (as may be easily seen for shorter steps [11]) or, in the case of evaporation–condensation, to one, due to the constraint of conserving, or not, the average step position, see Fig. 5. For evaporation–condensation, the related diffusion coefficient is rather small and depends on the step length. In any event, the late-time behaviour reflects the finite length of the step.

The time dependence of γ_{eff} , as depicted in Fig. 5, implies that an average effective exponent, γ_a , as obtained from a log–log plot of $G(t)$ in a given time range, may vary with experimental parameters when one is not in the truly asymptotic regime. In particular, the plateau in γ_{eff} may not yet have been reached or finite size effects may already matter. Note that, for instance, the crossover from the diffusive short-time behaviour to the subdiffusive step motion at later times is temperature dependent, thereby causing possibly a temperature dependence in γ_a . Similarly, the presence of a neighbouring step is expected to affect γ_a . In general, much care is needed in identifying and disentangling the numerous possible crossover effects.

5. Summary

We studied equilibrium step fluctuations in a somewhat idealized way by enumerating random walks on terraces with various constraints and using Monte Carlo techniques.

In the simulations, different atomistic mechanisms determining the equilibrium step fluctuations may be mimicked by special choices of the return probability for atoms attaching at distance l from the detachment site of the step. The form of the return probability at large distances l determines the time dependence of the step fluctuations $G(t)$ at late times t for long steps. In particular, we simulated evaporation–condensation kinetics, step diffusion and (perfect) terrace diffusion. For *isolated* steps, $G(t)$ is confirmed to increase with a power law $G(t) \propto t^\gamma$, with $\gamma = 1/2$, $1/3$, and $1/4$, respectively. In the case of terrace diffusion for *pairs* of steps, the dynamic exponent γ approaches the value of step diffusion, $\gamma = 1/4$. The simulational observations agree with and refine predictions of Langevin theory.– Similarly, a Fourier analysis of the step fluctuations, driven by the different atomic mechanisms, confirms and refines previous Langevin descriptions.

In general, crossover phenomena may mask the asymptotic behaviour of $G(t)$. Such phenomena can be caused by several reasons, including change from diffusive to subdiffusive step motions at early times, effect of the finite step length, defects on the terrace, and influence of neighbouring steps. As a result, the average effective dynamic exponent γ_a , as usually obtained from measurements, may vary with experimental parameters like temperature.

From the exact enumeration of random walks, the decay of the return probability distribution $p(l) \propto l^{-2}$ for unbiased terrace diffusion with straight steps is found to be robust against step roughness and (elastic) interactions between the diffusing atom and the neighbouring step. This fact implies the robustness of the value $\gamma = 1/3$ for isolated steps. Moreover, for pairs of steps, the exponential decay of $p(l)$ persists in the presence of those perturbations, implying the robustness of $\gamma = 1/4$ in that case.

Acknowledgement

We should like to thank H. P. Bonzel, T. L. Einstein, H. Ibach, and M. Giesen for useful

discussions and remarks.

References

1. L. Kuipers, M. S. Hoogeman, and J. W. M. Frenken, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3517.
2. M. Giesen-Seibert, R. Jentjes, M. Poensgen, and H. Ibach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3521.
3. M. Giesen, G. S. Schulze Icking-Konert, D. Stapel, and H. Ibach, Surf. Sci. 366 (1996) 229.
4. W. W. Pai, N. C. Bartelt, and J. E. Reutt-Robey, Phys. Rev. B 53 (1996) 15991.
5. P. Wang, H. Pfnür, S. V. Khare, T. L. Einstein, E. D. Williams, W. W. Pai, and J. E. Reutt-Robey, Phys. Rev. B 53 (1996) 15991.
6. S. Tanaka, N. C. Bartelt, C. C. Umbach, R. M. Tromp, and J. M. Blakely, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 3342.
7. N. C. Bartelt, T. L. Einstein, and E. D. Williams, Surf. Sci. 312 (1994) 411.
8. A. Pimpinelli, J. Villain, D. E. Wolf, J. J. Metois, J. C. Heyraud, I. Elkinani, and G. Uimin, Surf. Sci. 295 (1993) 143.
9. B. Blagojevic and P. M. Duxbury, in : Dynamics of Crystal Surfaces and Interfaces, Eds. P. M. Duxbury and T. Pence (Plenum, New York, 1997) p.1.
10. S. V. Khare and T. L. Einstein, Phys Rev. B57 (1998) 4782.
11. W. Selke and M. Bisani, Lecture Notes in Physics 519 (1999) 298.
12. I. Majid, D. Ben-Avraham, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, Phys Rev. B30 (1984) 1626.
13. K. Binder and D. W. Heermann, Monte Carlo Simulations in Statistical Physics (Springer, Heidelberg, 1992).
14. M. Bisani, Diploma thesis, RWTH Aachen (1998).

15. W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications (John Wiley, New York, 1968).
16. B. S. Swartzentruber, Y.-W. Mo, R. Kariotis, M. G. Lagally, and M. B. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 1913.
17. J. D. Weeks, in : Ordering in Strongly Fluctuating Condensed Matter Systems, Ed. T. Riste (Plenum, New York, 1980) p.293.
18. A. B. Bortz, M. H. Kalos, and J. L. Lebowitz, J. Comp. Phys. 17 (1975) 10.
19. V. I. Marchenko and A. Y. Parshin, Sov. Phys. JETP 52 (1980) 129.
20. W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, Numerical Recipes in C (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).

Figure Captions

Fig. 1: Geometry of the surface, showing the reference step and a descending (s_r) or rising (s_a) opposite step.

Fig. 2: Effective exponent α_{eff} of the return probability distribution $p(l)$ for the unbiased random walk with a straight reference step ($L = 600$, $d = 600$). Absorbing terrace boundaries, t_a , were used.

Fig. 3: Return probability distribution $p(l)$ for random walks in a repulsive external potential $V = Ay^{-2}$ at $k_B T = 1$, for $L = 600$, $d = 600$, and with $s_a : t_a$ boundary conditions.

Fig. 4: Effective exponent α_{eff} of $p(l)$ for random walks with defects on the terrace ($d = 50$, $L = 100$, concentration of defects $c = 0.2$, averaged over 8778 realisations, with $s_a : t_a$ boundary conditions). The dashed line is based on smoothed data obtained by applying a Savitzky-Golay-filter [20].

Fig. 5: Effective dynamic exponent γ_{eff} as a function of time (measured in units of MCA) for various atomistic mechanisms and return probabilities. From top to bottom: evaporation–condensation (solid), $p_{\text{da}}(l) \propto l^{-2}$ (solid), $\propto l^{-3}$ (solid), $\propto e^{-l}$ (dotted), $= 1/2$ for $l = \pm 1$ (dashed). Data was smoothed using a Savitzky-Golay-filter. Steps with 256 sites, at $k_B T/\epsilon = 1$ were simulated.

Fig. 6: I_k vs. k/M (in units of 2π) for different transport mechanisms: evaporation–condensation (plus), terrace diffusion with $p_{\text{da}}(l) \propto l^{-2}$ (cross) and step diffusion with $p_{\text{da}}(l) = 1/2$ for $l = \pm 1$ (asterik). The lines correspond to the power–law behaviour expected from Langevin theory: $I_k \propto k^2$ (solid), $I_k \propto k^3$ (dashed) and $I_k \propto k^4$ (dotted), respectively. Steps with 64 sites, at $k_B T/\epsilon = 0.8$, were simulated.











